

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the accompanying amendment in response to the Quayle action dated July 29, 2003.

Summary of Quayle Action

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 are allowed with the exception of certain formal matters.

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 18, and 19 were amended. Applicant respectfully submits the amendments to the claims do not add new matter.

Response to Approval of Drawing Corrections

The proposed drawing corrections submitted November 4, 2002 were indicated as being approved. Although the Office Action Summary indicates that corrected drawings are required in reply, applicant provided a set of formal drawings incorporating the proposed changes with the approved drawings changes. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge prior receipt of the formal drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that there should not be any outstanding requirement for formal drawings.

Response to Quayle Action

The Examiner indicated that amendments were required for claims 1, 4, 5, 13, 17, 18, 19. The Examiner also stated that the subject matter recited in claim 3 was already disclosed in claim 1, lines 3-6.

Claims 1, 5, 18, and 19 have been amended as indicated above. The Examiner's suggestions and any amendments to the claims are discussed below.

With respect to claim 1, instead of deleting "the" before "total transconductance", applicant replaced "the" with --a-- for proper antecedent basis. The article "the" before "remaining" was deleted as requested.

With respect to claim 3, applicant can only comment on the Examiner's statement. Claim 1 requires that the *collective* plurality (comprising a first and a second plurality of transconductors) include at least one adjustable transconductor. Claim 3 explicitly requires *each of the first and second pluralities of transconductors* to include at least one adjustable transconductor. Thus claim 3 requires *at least two adjustable transconductors* distributed such that *each* of the first and second plurality of transconductors has at least one adjustable transconductor in contrast to claim 1.

With respect to claim 4, applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 4 depends from claim 3. Given that claim 3 requires that *each* of the first and second plurality of transconductors to includes at least one transconductor with an adjustable transconductance, this means that *there must be at least two adjustable transconductors*. Thus in claim 4, applicant has properly referred to "adjustable transconductors" (i.e., plural) as opposed to "adjustable transconductor"

suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully declines to amend claim 4 as requested.

With respect to claim 5, applicant has inserted --voltage-- after “signal” at line 2 as suggested.

With respect to claim 13, applicant respectfully submits such language is not required.

With respect to claim 17, applicant respectfully submits that the same argument presented with respect to claims 3 and 4 above apply. Claim 17 includes the language “wherein *each* of the first and second nodes has at least one associated adjustable transconductor”. Clearly, this means that there must be at least two adjustable transconductors (i.e., plural). Thus applicant submits that use of the plural term “transconductors” is proper.

With respect to claim 18, applicant notes that claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17 instead of claim 14. Thus claim 18 requires at least two adjustable transconductors (i.e., plural). Thus applicant submits that use of the plural term “transconductors” is proper.

Also with respect to claim 18, the Examiner has asked applicant to define the term “ δ ”. Applicant respectfully submits that “ δ ” is defined within the claim to be the amount by which the transconductance of a transconductor associated with the first node is increased and the amount by which the transconductance of a transconductor associated with the second node is decreased.

Claim 19 has been amended to refer to “any adjustable transconductor” instead of “the adjustable transconductors”. Claim 19 was further amended to

delete "the" before "remaining" as suggested by the Examiner. (Applicant interpreted the Examiner's reference to "claim 29" as suggestions for claim 19).

Applicant respectfully submits all the issues identified by the Examiner have been addressed and that the application should be permitted to proceed to allowance without further delay.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the outstanding formal matters set forth in the Quayle action have been addressed. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance in the present application.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (512) 306-9470.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 7, 2003

William D. Davis
William D. Davis
Reg No. 38,428